			1
1 2	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA AIKEN DIVISION		
3			
4	UNITED STATES OF AMER	ICA CR NO.: 1:12-333 Columbia, SC	
5	-vs-	May 8, 2013	
6	TERRANCE LAMAR WIGGINS,		
7	Defendant		
8			
9	DEFORE HON MARCARET D. CHYMOLD		
10	BEFORE HON. MARGARET B. SEYMOUR SENIOR UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE		
11		SENTENCING HEARING	
12	APPEARANCES:		
13			
14		ON. WILLIAM N. NETTLES NITED STATES ATTORNEY	
15		Y: JULIUS NESS RICHARDSON ssistant United States Attorney	
16		441 Main Street olumbia, SC 29201	
17		BYRON E. GIPSON, ESQ.	
18		.O. Box 1825 rangeburg, SC 29115	
19			
20	COURT REPORTER: D.	ANIEL E. MAYO, RDR	
21	C	ertified Realtime Reporter 01 Richland Street	
22		olumbia, SC 29201	
23	STENOTYPE/COMPUTER-AIDED TRANSCRIPTION		
24	SIENOITEE/ COMPOTEN-AIDED INANSCRIPTION		
25			

3 accountable for 200 kilograms of cocaine. You are withdrawing 1 2 that objection? MR. GIPSON: Yes, ma'am. 3 THE COURT: Mr. Wiggins, you agree with that? 4 5 Wiggins, do you agree with that? 6 DEFENDANT: Not really. 7 MR. GIPSON: Then we will proceed, your Honor. 8 THE COURT: All right. So the objection is that you 9 disagree with being held accountable for 200 kilograms of 10 cocaine. 11 DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am. 12 MR. GIPSON: Yes, ma'am. That's his objection, your 13 Honor. 14 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Richardson? MR. RICHARDSON: Your Honor, I think from the 15 16 government's perspective, your Honor sat through the trial and 17 I think you heard from quite a few of the individuals that 18 testified, Manuel Soto-Gonzalez as well as Christopher Davis. 19 Taking those two alone just the trial testimony that was 20 presented exceeded 200 kilograms of cocaine. We think both of 21 those were highly credible individuals who have testified 22 before your Honor and your Honor was able to evaluate their 23 testimony. 24 That testimony alone before your Honor that the jury 25 heard is sufficient to exceed the 200 kilogram threshold.

There is other testimony, obviously, that supports that and there are other individuals who provided information about cocaine dealing that Mr. Wiggins did with them that would actually be in addition to that 200 kilograms. I think probation correctly took the conservative end of that because anything over 150 kilograms doesn't make any difference with respect to the guidelines. I think they appropriately used what your Honor heard about. There are a number of paragraphs in the presentence report that describe the extent of his drug dealing, you know, a drug dealing enterprise that led to the, you know, accumulation of \$750,000 in cash, a Land Rover, a Camaro, a motorcycle, the house with a pool, et cetera, that your Honor heard lots about during the trial.

We think the 200 kilograms here is a very low estimate, actually, comes as only a fraction of what Mr. Wiggins was actually involved with. It's been laid out in the presentence report, I think probation addressed this appropriately. The final thing I'll add, your Honor, a flat denial is not sufficient for purposes of an objection.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Gipson, what evidence do you have as to the amount of drugs sold and what is your testimony with regard to the inaccuracy or unreliability of the information provided in the presentence report?

MR. GIPSON: Your Honor, I've now been advised that Mr. Wiggins would like to withdraw that particular objection,

5 your Honor. 1 2 THE COURT: All right. 3 MR. GIPSON: Make sure that -- I'd ask if the court would consider just asking him on the record, because I just 4 5 want to make sure --6 THE COURT: Mr. Wiggins, initially you had objected 7 to paragraph 84 and 109 of the presentence report. In those paragraphs you are being held accountable for 200 kilograms of 8 9 cocaine. Are you --10 DEFENDANT: I just feel that --11 THE COURT: -- withdrawing your -- are you 12 withdrawing the objection? 13 DEFENDANT: Yes. I feel withdrawing, because anybody 14 could say anything about what --15 THE COURT: All right. So Mr. Gipson as your 16 attorney will now have to present evidence to convince me that that 200 kilograms is inaccurate or unreliable. And what is 17 18 the evidence for that? Mr. Gipson, do you need more time to 19 speak with your client? 20 MR. GIPSON: Just only briefly, your Honor. 21 (Mr. Gipson and defendant confer) 22 THE COURT: Let me just say that in developing the 23 presentence report to establish the drug amounts that are 24 attributable to Mr. Wiggins the probation officer relied on 25 the trial testimony provided by Christopher Davis and Manuel

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. RICHARDSON: Your Honor, if he's going to testify

we would ask him be placed under oath and take the witness and

8 does withdraw it I've considered the objection because you've 1 2 raised it, I also understand what the drug weight is based on, 3 the testimony of Mr. Davis and Mr. Soto-Gonzalez. I listened to their testimony and find it to be credible. Therefore, I'm 4 5 going to overrule the objection. 6 MR. GIPSON: Yes, ma'am. 7 THE COURT: Okay. What's the next objection? Paragraph 86 and 87? That is an objection to the four level 8 9 enhancement. 10 MR. GIPSON: Yes, ma'am, for obstruction of justice, 11 your Honor. 12 THE COURT: This is just the four level enhancement, not the obstruction of justice. 13 14 MR. GIPSON: Yes, ma'am. In terms of the role, your Honor, I apologize, it's our position, your Honor, that under 15 16 that particular objection Mr. Wiggins has admitted that he 17 sold drugs during some periods of time and that in his 18 proffer, your Honor, that was admitted to, your Honor. 19 even if through the testimony that was given during the trial 20 there was testimony that he either bought from 21 Mr. Soto-Gonzalez or that at points in time Mr. Davis, he 22 purchased things from those two, your Honor. I think that to 23 suggest that he was essentially a -- we were inferring that he 24 would had to have been a higher up participant, your Honor,

there was never any information requested from either of these

25

gentlemen to say whether he worked for them, whether there is somebody particular Mr. Wiggins was working for.

And just to presume that he was a higher level participant because of -- essentially because of the amount of money that -- I think that the money that was accumulated and the money that was seized as a result of Mr. Wiggins' giving them information about where those moneys were, I think that's part of the reason why he's looked at in terms of a person in a higher role. There is a significant amount of drugs that we're talking about, but I don't know that the testimony that was given suggests -- does anything more than suggest he could be a higher level participant, your Honor.

I don't think there was -- they suggested he directed any particular activities, you know, for four or more or five people or more. I think the information was suggested at some point in time there might have been two people who had bought from him and worked for him that testified here in court, your Honor. But I think that was the extent of what was provided.

So I suggest that the enhancement there is not necessarily proper. Again, we're aware of that 150, you know, kilogram number that's been placed out there, we're aware of the substantial amounts of money, but I think the testimony we heard here in court didn't suggest that he is a higher level participant, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

MR. RICHARDSON: Your Honor, again, turning back to probation here, and I think they sum it up exceedingly well in describing the extent of the offense conduct here. And I'm looking on page three of the addendum, the first full paragraph beginning at the second sentence, where probation explained that throughout the description here the individual who provided information on Mr. Wiggins explained that he utilized a wide array of people to sell guns for him. The names that are listed there, Mr. Washington Mr. Dunbar, Mr. Skeen —

MR. GIPSON: You said guns, sold guns. I just -MR. RICHARDSON: I apologize. Cocaine. I'm
referring to cocaine.

MR. GIPSON: Thank you.

MR. RICHARDSON: And certainly this is a reference toward cocaine. There is evidence that he did supply guns to people that were distributing narcotics for him, that's also relayed in the presentence report. But this was specifically about using individuals to distribute narcotics for him. So all of those witnesses, your Honor, establish he was running a drug organization in and around Barnwell.

But you don't even have to rely just on them. In fact, Mr. Wiggins' own statements establish that that is what took place. Mr. Wiggins stated repeatedly, including in various reports that your Honor heard about during the

December 4 hearing before your Honor, where you took testimony and heard evidence that Mr. Wiggins described using family members to deliver drugs, to open up the house, to weigh out the supply money — or not money, that was referring in particular to his brother Edwin and others. That those individuals were part and parcel of the drug enterprise that he was running.

We think there's extensive evidence and, in fact, as much evidence as seen in these cases, that Mr. Wiggins wasn't just a middleman in this process but employed in a sense a number of people to distribute narcotics for him. It's laid out in detail throughout the offense conduct, the individuals he was using as part of his drug business. We think that is exactly what the leadership role envisions. Mr. Wiggins is the prototypical leader in this type of a drug organization.

MR. GIPSON: Your Honor, I suggest it's up to the government to present its case the way it chooses to, but, your Honor, he talks about these folks that were a part of this enterprise. The only person who testified during this trial that we had Earl Davis who testified who said that at some point in time he worked with Mr. Wiggins. I think the other information, your Honor, and I'd say is — credibility can be questioned of the persons who may have provided other information. Because, number one, they were never called to trial to be cross-examined; two, oftentimes people place

information in their proffers and speak about information that's not necessarily true and they are subject to being cross-examined about it. And the question and the problem Mr. Wiggins has with that is the fact if there are people who may speak on these things we can never speak to or never particularly come in and say what they say is not justified, your Honor.

I just, again, he's admitted to the things that he did and that he specifically did during many of the conversations that he had with law enforcement, your Honor. But the enhancement I just don't think is proper just based on the testimony that we received. He did buy, he did sell, and there are I think a minimum number of people who came in and spoke about him actually controlling an enterprise.

THE COURT: It seems to me that according to the probation officer's report there was evidence uncovered during the investigation that indicated that Mr. Wiggins functioned as an organizer or leader in the drug trafficking conspiracy. There were several cooperating witnesses and coconspirators, including Christopher Jefferson, Eugene Folk, Frederick Pressie, Manuel Soto-Gonzalez, Christopher Davis, and there was a confidential source of information, and all of these people indicated that Mr. Wiggins had other cocaine dealers such as Shawn Washington, Roger Dunbar, and Randolph Skeen make cocaine transactions on his behalf.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

In addition, Mr. Wiggins was involved in coordinating the actions of his brother Edwin Wiggins and his half brother Cawarren Jenkins to leave drug proceeds in his residence or deliver cocaine to his customers. And Mr. Wiggins has admitted the exercise, that he exercised control over his siblings when he was interviewed by the Special Agent David Fellerman. So based on that information it would appear that the enhancement would be appropriate if he was involved with exercising some decision making authority over all of these individuals. MR. GIPSON: Yes, ma'am. THE COURT: And do you have any evidence to the contrary that he was not involved with these individuals? MR. GIPSON: I do not, your Honor. THE COURT: Do you have any evidence that would suggest any of these individuals were not being truthful? Do you have anything to --

(Mr. Gipson and Mr. Wiggins confer)

MR. GIPSON: No, ma'am, we do not.

THE COURT: The objections to paragraph 86 and 87 with respect to role adjustment is overruled.

The next objection has to do with paragraph 88, 89 and 90, adjustment for obstruction of justice. The defendant objects to these paragraphs regarding the obstruction of justice enhancement. And the basis for the paragraph, or

basis for the enhancement is the fact that based on the evidence he engaged in obstructive conduct by concealing or directing other persons to conceal evidence that was material to the investigation and you are objecting to that. What is your evidence to the contrary?

MR. GIPSON: Well, your Honor, my evidence to the contrary, I mean, is as we look at the addendum that was provided your Honor, the sentencing report suggests that he repeatedly provided false statements to federal agents regarding, you know, his dealings during the -- dealing with drug trafficking. I suggest to the court that that's not true, your Honor. He met with agents for at least ten plus hours and went through multiple just pages and pages of information that dealt with his involvement, others' involvement, made at least three calls to attempt to set up controlled buys. He did several things, your Honor.

I think the piece that they are really referring to is the fact that early in the process he was asked during one of the proffer sessions if there was any other money that was there and he suggested there may not be. After we met and spoke briefly Mr. Wiggins went back and met with them and gave them all of the information as to where the money could be found, and then they confiscated the additional moneys, your Honor. I think that's kind of the crux what of what we're speaking of.

He gave them that information, your Honor, they confiscated moneys, and as the court knows, as Mr. Richardson has mentioned, there have been over -- has been over \$750,000, or close to it, confiscated in this case. When the police came to his residence, your Honor, he told them where the things were in the residence and he later told them where the other moneys were and so that they could confiscate those, as well. That was done, your Honor, in an attempt at that point in a proffer session, in a series of proffer sessions wherein he gave them information and he truthfully gave them the information about where his assets were.

I think the piece that kind of stands out here is when you look at the presentence report, and also I'd refer back to the actual date of the actual investigation — the polygraph that was attempted by Agent Fellerman, your Honor, that was on 27th, I believe, of November. And in paragraph four of his particular report Agent Fellerman says that Mr. Wiggins was interviewed regarding his brother Edwin's involvement in this drug trafficking organization and stated the following.

That was really the crux of what they wanted to know, just what was Edwin's involvement, your Honor. It wasn't about all of these other matters that the presentence report suggests were obstructive, it was about this one particular matter, and that doesn't -- and that was the question, your

Honor. And because the court determined at that point that he was not completely forthright about that one issue that's what threw out the actual -- that's what allowed his proffer to be used against him at trial.

And I would suggest that's the piece where he was not truthful. If he wasn't truthful, that's the piece where he wasn't truthful. Not about the other matters that probation, excuse me, or that's being suggested in the PSR. He gave them this information and he gave them everything and his information actually led to the confiscation of all of these assets, your Honor. So I suggest that he was absolutely truthful, Judge.

In these situations sometimes it takes multiple sessions to meet with people in order for them to understand fully what -- what's required of them if they are going to proceed and cooperate. And this is no different than many other situations. They met multiple times. He gave, again, hours and hours of testimony, your Honor, to them. And that ultimately, Judge, is what was used here in trial to -- it was used to convict him, as well, just some of his own words. I suggest obstruction. It's -- he gave them the information and he gave -- and the giving of that information was subsequently found to be true because they found the moneys exactly where he said they would be found.

THE COURT: Mr. Richardson?

MR. RICHARDSON: Your Honor, two things here. Your Honor on December 4 of 2012 already found that Mr. Wiggins lied to federal agents as part of the investigation. That was the finding you made with respect to the breach of the proffer. That standing alone is sufficient for an obstruction enhancement to apply. I don't really think we have to go any further than that. That's the simplest way. Your Honor already made that finding, you held a full hearing on that on December 4, and we would rely upon the evidence we presented there.

The other issue that you raised and the probation relied upon was that shortly after the arrest Mr. Wiggins called his brother and directed him to go to remove evidence in order to obstruct justice, is the government's position. Probation I think recounts that. We think that the lying to federal agents and trying to destroy evidence is exactly what obstruction is.

THE COURT: All right. In the United States

Sentencing Guidelines Section 3C1.1, that section requires a

finding that the defendant should receive the obstruction of

justice enhancement, because specifically the application note

4D of 3C1.1 provides that obstructive conduct includes

destroying or concealing or directing or procuring another

person to destroy or conceal evidence that is material to an

official investigation or judicial proceeding. The note

further -- application note 4G further identifies as obstructive conduct providing materially false statements to a law enforcement officer that significantly obstructed or impeded the official investigation or prosecution of the offense.

It would appear that the evidence would support both of those provisions, that he directed or procured another to destroy or conceal evidence, and also that he provided materially false information to a law enforcement agency. Do you have anything else, Mr. Gipson?

MR. GIPSON: No, your Honor, we don't wish to present any additional testimony. I would just suggest that with the information that was offered the question is whether or not it's significantly impeded the investigation of this matter, your Honor. And with that matter, Judge, with all of the other information that we have spoken about and the court has heard about, our position is that one portion of information that he cured within a couple of weeks of making that statement to them, your Honor, I don't know that that impeded the progress of their investigation.

Your Honor, this investigation has been vast and it's gone in several different directions, and that one piece of evidence, your Honor, I suggest did not --

THE COURT: There's more than one portion. You're leaving out the fact he asked someone to conceal evidence.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. GIPSON: And it's been my position -- I've listened to all of those phone calls, your Honor. provided those phone calls and listened to them. There was conversations about moneys, and I don't know that there was ever a direct request that somebody move money, your Honor. That is my position, your Honor. Just in listening to those phone calls multiple times in preparation for trial and actually going back even, you know, through preparing for this hearing, your Honor. THE COURT: All right. The objection is overruled. MR. GIPSON: Thank you. THE COURT: The next objection is paragraph 91, adjustment for acceptance of responsibility. MR. GIPSON: Yes, ma'am. And, just briefly, in reference to acceptance of responsibility, again, through these multiple meetings, your Honor, over ten hours of meetings which took place with the government, your Honor, Mr. Wiggins was clear about the fact that he accepted responsibility. I think the issue was whether or not he was going to implicate any family members in the matter. And he always said this is something that I did, was my responsibility, I did these things.

And he never tried to shirk responsibility, he never tried to place it on anyone else. He never tried to say well, this person made me do it or I was forced to do this, or I

was, you know, pushed into doing these things. He always said he did these things. And, your Honor, he chose to go to trial and after choosing to go to trial, being found guilty, your Honor, he's always maintained that this is something that, you know, I particularly did and the responsibility lies with me.

I know the court can, if it chooses, determine that he did accept responsibility even though he's been found guilty. And, your Honor, in those proffer sessions, all of those proffer sessions he told what he did. He said I did these things, I sold this, I did this, I did this, I did this. It was always an I. And he's been clear about these things throughout, and I accept he has accepted responsibility and he continues to accept responsibility although he chose to go it trial.

THE COURT: Anything else from you, Mr. Richardson?

MR. RICHARDSON: Not unless you have questions, your

Honor.

THE COURT: Well, it appears that the defendant engaged in obstructive conduct by breaching his proffer agreement, by failing to disclose his full knowledge of and involvement in drug trafficking activities. The objection is overruled.

MR. GIPSON: Thank you, your Honor. I believe that's all of our objections at this point.

THE COURT: All right. There being no further

objections, as findings of fact of this court for the purpose of sentencing the court finds that the statutory provisions are as follows: Count one is 20 years to life, count three is five years to life consecutive to any other term of imprisonment, and count four is ten years.

Supervised release on count one is at least ten years, count three not more than five years, count four not more than three years. The fine on count one is \$20 million, on count three is \$250,000, and count four \$250,000. The special assessment fee is \$100 as to each count one, three and four.

The guideline provisions are as follows: The total offense level is 43, the criminal history category five. The guideline range is life imprisonment as to counts one and four, 60 months imprisonment to run consecutive to any other term of imprisonment imposed as to count three.

At least ten years of supervised release as to count one, two to five years of supervised release on count three, and one to three years of supervised release as to count four. There is a \$300 special assessment fee.

Are there any objections as to the statutory provisions or the guideline provisions?

MR. RICHARDSON: None, your Honor.

MR. GIPSON: No, ma'am.

THE COURT: The court adopts the previously stated

provisions. Mr. Gipson, I will hear from you at this time with regard to the sentence to be imposed in this case.

MR. GIPSON: Thank you, your Honor. If it please the court, I'll speak briefly, your Honor, then I believe there are just four family members who are here who would like to speak on his behalf if the court would allow. Those members will be, your Honor, Pastor Michael O'Neil, Joyce Foust who is his aunt, his mother Frances Brown and, lastly, his sister Tamara Anderson.

Your Honor, I suggest to the court, understanding what the guideline range is, I ask the court consider varying from the guideline range because of some of the facts that we talked about before, but I'll just briefly explain to the court my position.

When you look at the guideline factors, your Honor, there are several ways that his criminal conduct can be deterred without imposing a life sentence, your Honor. Mr. Wiggins, your Honor, has been in jail since April of last year. Your Honor, he's got three children, he's got one who was born while he was actually in jail and never been able to physically touch that child, your Honor.

I suggest that understanding that we have essentially in this court a -- in this case, your Honor, a 20 year minimum he's got to -- mandatory minimum and then a five year consecutive term and we're looking at 25 years. Your Honor,

by my calculation it goes to 300 or so months, your Honor. That's something that the court, it seems, would have to impose in this case. I suggest to the court that that is reasonable in this matter. Because there has been or it's our position that there has been acceptance of responsibility.

It's our position that during those hours and hours of proffer sessions, your Honor, the government received vast amounts of information. Quite frankly, if he had cooperated and chosen not to go to trial, your Honor, he would have been in a position similar to Manuel Soto-Gonzalez and some of the others who were able to testify and the give information and work for a downward departure.

I know that's not where we stand in this particular case, your Honor, but the government still is able to make use of all of the information that Mr. Wiggins gave to them, your Honor, and they are able to do this. And I understand, you know, with proffer agreements they have that ability, I understand it's a contract and they have the ability if there's a breach to proceed as they choose to proceed. I understand all of those things.

But I'd ask that the court consider a variance, that it sentence him underneath something less than life, your Honor. And that situation would at least allow Mr. Wiggins to at some point in time be able to -- he can pay his debt back to society, your Honor. He can -- has worked before in the

past your Honor. He's done other types of work. But it would at least allow him to have a chance and some kind of glimmer of hope to get back to his family.

Your Honor, 25 years, 30 years, those are large numbers, especially for a man essentially 33 years old. Your Honor, that's a generation and a half. And it's our position that with the information that he's given to the government he's at least shown that he cares about — he's given them information that they can use to bring others to justice. And that alone, your Honor, in some lights allows them — he's chosen to plead guilty to essentially qualify for acceptance of responsibility and other manners of departing from his sentence.

We just ask that you consider that factor, your Honor, consider the fact that he's been in the bad situation here, your Honor, and I believe that he's tried to do what he can to cooperate. And although he did choose to go to trial he did so, your Honor, but he, through that process preceding going to trial he did accept responsibility for what he had done and what he -- and the pain that he had caused to the family and others, your Honor. And I'd ask the to court consider those things.

Briefly, your Honor, he again assisted in giving them all the information about assets where his three-quarters of a million dollars in assets were seized, your Honor. I think

that that shows, again, that he has some respect for law enforcement. When law enforcement came to the home he told them where things were in the home, your Honor. It speaks to the way — the fact that he was raised well. He made a bad decision to go down the road of selling drugs and to participate in this type of enterprise, but he's got lots of family members who are here, your Honor, who have come to speak on his behalf and love him dearly, and who understand that he's committed a crime.

He understands that, your Honor, and I know he wants to speak to the court, address the court. But I believe that a sentence of 30 years or even if you look at those guidelines and look at a level 40 as opposed to a level 43, even a level 41, your Honor, there are ways that a sentence can be constructed that would allow him to pay his debt back to society. Because that is an extremely long time to pay one's debt, which he has to pay because he was found guilty of these things, your Honor.

But I just ask that you consider something underneath life to give him that glimmer of hope. I suggest to the court that he used drugs extensively at one period of time and that he had a problem with cocaine, your Honor. I'd ask the court consider, you know, during the sentence he be screened for the drug treatment program, your Honor, and anything vocational he may qualify for because those things can help him in the

future.

But I just ask that you consider the fact that he did, aside from choosing to go to trial, your Honor, everything that he did preceding trial lined up for somebody who had cooperated and who would have been one of those witnesses that was testifying as opposed to a defendant sitting here at trial. And but for that decision he would still be in the position that many are to receive some of those benefits, and I'd ask the court consider that, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

MR. GIPSON: I'd ask if the court would allow Pastor Michael O'Neil to come forward.

THE COURT: All right.

PROBATION OFFICER: Your Honor, may I approach?

THE COURT: You may.

(There was a pause in the proceedings)

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Would you give us your name?

PASTOR O'NEIL: Pastor Michael O'Neil.

THE COURT: I'll hear from you at this time.

PASTOR O'NEIL: Your Honor, to the court, to all the officials here, to the family, to Mr. Wiggins, I come standing as a pastor, Terrance's pastor, his family's pastor, and come here not so much to try and make any type of reckless

statements or anything no more than I would very generally in the community. I work very diligently trying to make our community a more prosperous and productive community. I've had an opportunity to interact with Mr. Wiggins over the ten years or so that I have been at Rosemary Baptist Church praying with him, encouraging him, trying to guide him in whatever way I possibly can as I do with so other many young mens and young ladies in our community from the schools, to partnering with local churches in our community to try and make a difference.

I'm here on behalf of Terrance and his family to plead for a second chance, an opportunity for him to get to know his children, an opportunity for him to be a productive citizen back in the community. I'm not here to weigh on whether he's guilty or not. I don't know any of that no more than any information that you have. But I'm here to support this family, I'm here to support him and encourage him.

As the Bible would say, that he that is without sin cast the first stone. And I know that he's made some mistakes and we all have made mistakes, and I'm not here to cast judgment or either put weight on what mistake weighs more than another one. But I know that all of us deserve a second chance and an opportunity to make better decisions, to correct our wrongs, to pay our debt to society in whatever way and manner that is possible.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I've come before you today to plead for mercy for this young man, that he may be the father that he can't be being behind prison walls, that he could be the son or he could be an inspiration to those ones who are still out there in the community, may not really understand what it is to do the right thing or the penalty for doing those things that are not constructive in society. I come before you today to ask that you would have leniency on him in a way and manner that allow him to be -become an active participant in this community and the church and in the this world in which we living that some young man, some young lady won't travel back down the same road that he's made the mistakes on this far. THE COURT: All right. Thank you very much. PASTOR O'NEIL: Thank you. MR. GIPSON: Thank you, sir. Your Honor, next we have his aunt. MS. FOUST: Your Honor, I thank you for giving me this chance to speak on behalf of my nephew Terrance Wiggins. Terrance, I'd just like to share --THE COURT: Would you state your name for the record, please? MS. FOUST: Joyce Foust, F-O-U-S-T. THE COURT: Thank you. MS. FOUST: Terrance on many occasions, by working in his yard, asked me to come over for advice on how he should plant things. And during those conversations we talked about family, his love for his family and his love for his children. Terrance loved to cook, and on many occasions he would cook and he would invite family members over.

And also during conversations Terrance shared with me what he wanted to do with his life. He told me that he was interested in becoming a chef, and I encouraged him to look into schools that he could find to attend to bring his dream forth. And I'm just asking you to take these things in consideration, that he is a family man, that he did have hope and change in turning his life around for the better to do things that would be something to help his community. I thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. GIPSON: Your Honor, coming forth is Frances Brown, who is Mr. Wiggins' mother, and his sister Tamara Anderson standing next to her.

THE COURT: If you would state your name, please.

MRS. BROWN: Frances Renee Brown.

THE COURT: All right.

MRS. BROWN: Honorable Judge Seymour, right now my heart is heavy, it's heavy. Any parent got a child going through stuff their heart is heavy. Just -- I just want to talk about my son. I know everybody picked him to be the

worst person in Barnwell County, but he's not the worst person in Barnwell County. He did make a mistake, Lord, and he knows he made a mistake. And just the other night he say, momma, I talk to the Lord, he say, a couple days before the -- I talked to the Lord and asked him to make a change in my life. And I said you know what, Terrance, I say, he did. I say, you know, sometimes we go through things and the Lord put us through things, trials and tribulations so we can see what we do wrong. Because if nothing ever goes wrong you -- just running the wrong way.

So I say the Lord did, did do it for you. He did.

And I believe the Lord's going to do everything as he told us he's going to do. Always — my son get hit by a school bus, he was two years old, and I thank the Lord that's the first miracle he did for us. Because he could have been gone. And I always preach to him and say, you know what, Terrance, I say, you got hit by a bus when you was two years old. I said the other little boy in the hospital just got hit by a car and I say, you know, the Lord blessed you and I say he kept you here for a reason.

And I say the Lord is going to get his glory because he didn't -- he didn't allowed you to die. He allowed you to stay here. And we all go through trials and tribulations sometimes, and the Lord does that. But he can open his eyes.

And when he was in prison it was some kind of class,

sometime I remember, I think it was turn your life around to Christ, turn to Christ, I don't remember, turn to Christ. And we came, we had lunch with him. The pastor was there that held the class, and he say to me, he talked to me and he say, you know, I see a difference in your son since he been here.

And I know that you hear this, I know you hear it for everybody that comes there about the Lord, but I truly believe this. Because, like say, I have been telling him this from when he was young. And all the -- you turn your life around to Christ, you have to give him that opportunity.

I know he did wrong. I'm just trusting and praying and asking you, your Honor, to give him mercy that he don't spend his whole life in prison. Because when he's in court not too long ago he was told he would leave out of prison in a box. That's the only way he was going leave prison, in a box. And I don't want that for my children, my son.

And I hope from the publicity and that went on in Barnwell County with my son and stuff on the Facebooks, that some child will get alerted from this and open the eyes and see that money is not everything. Money is the root of all evil. But the most precious thing in the world is life, a Godly life that you could have being able to walk -- just -- I just -- I'm just putting his life on the mercy of the court that he just get an opportunity. Because he's not, like I say, he not the monster, he's a son, he's a brother, he's a

nephew, he's an uncle, he's a grandson.

Now, I'm not going to justify what he did, because I can't. He don't justify what he did. He say he made a mistake and only thing he acknowledge the mistake he made is it not only affect his life, it affects everybody around him. And he's hurting for that. And I know he is. And I know I'm hurting for that. But just, Lord, just please find it in your heart that my son do not do life in jail. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you. Your name, please?

MS. ANDERSON: Judge, I'll take the opportunity to thank you for allowing my mother to get up here and speak in my brother's behalf. And also allowing us to move it to Wednesday so we could be here.

THE COURT: Give me your name, please.

MS. ANDERSON: Tamara Anderson.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MS. ANDERSON: I know some people may say that a lot of people find God when they go to jail or when they go to prison. But that is so untrue about my brother. My family is a praying family. We constantly pray. My brother does not know how many nights that I lay before God and pray for him. Because my great grandmother has always told me pray until something happens.

And I seen a huge change in my brother before all this happened. He was a good father to his kids, he made sure

that he was in their life. He was home, just like my aunt say. We did dinners together, we did Thanksgiving dinner together, we did Christmas together. He's a good cook. He sometimes tried to outdo me with his cooking. But we were a close-knit family before all this happened.

And just like my mother say, sometimes things have to happen before you completely change. Me and my mother was on the way to church one day, not to the church that she usually go to, and he called and he said mom, what time does church start? And we were, like my mom, he's not going to church this morning, but he actually got up to go to church. That may not sound a lot to you, but to us that is a huge, huge accomplishment. He went to church.

He was actually changing his life before all this happened. Just like my mother say, please have mercy on him. We do not want him to spend life in prison. And I thank you for the opportunity to get up here. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. GIPSON: Lastly, your Honor, Mr. Wiggins would like to address the court.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Wiggins, I'll hear from you at this time with regard to the sentence to be imposed in your case.

DEFENDANT: Your Honor, I thank you on my behalf to speak to the court. First I would like to thank God for the

opportunity to still be here and not loss in life, killed behind drugs, he still give me a chance to be living. I'd like to apologize to my family for all I put them through. I'm not perfect, I made a lot of mistakes in life. When they came and saying about me was the God's honest truth.

I lost my daddy when I was in elementary school. I never had a father figure, only had my mother. She gave me the chance to do the right thing but I chose the wrong path. Now I'm here standing before you asking for mercy on my situation.

I have three kids, newborn I never seen. And basically only I can say I'm sorry. I just want another chance at life. Just don't take my life away. Whatever is your will, whatever you can do to help me out, whatever you can do now or the near future, anything you can find out and get me back home close to my family so they don't forget about me.

I'm not the person that people came up here and say I was. I made -- I sold drugs, I'm not a -- I'm not -- I'm not just a killer, a gangbanger. I have a good heart and I always there for my family, whoever needed I was there. I never could say no. And I'm -- I want to tell the court I'm sorry for what I did. I apologize.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you very much. Anything else from you, Mr. Gipson?

MR. GIPSON: No, ma'am, that's all we have. We just ask you consider a sentence underneath the advisory guidelines.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Richardson?

MR. RICHARDSON: Thank you, your Honor. This is a case that your Honor has lived with almost as long as I have. It goes back to Christopher Davis' case that your Honor saw through Mr. Wiggins' part of that. And this is an instance where there is no legitimate reason to vary from the guideline sentence.

Mr. Wiggins is a large scale drug trafficker.

Hundreds and hundreds of kilograms of cocaine, trafficking in Barnwell, Barnwell County area. He had no legitimate employment, as his presentence report indicates. He reports one job or maybe two jobs, neither of which are confirmed by anybody that was at that company that he ever worked there.

And he's a recidivist. He's a category five, not category six is the very highest, but the next highest category of criminal history. Given his guideline range, given the offense conduct range, he would be a lifer under the guidelines even if he had no criminal history, much less having the extensive criminal record that he has involving cocaine, criminal domestic violence, as well as a firearm offense.

This is somebody that did it extensively. More than

three-quarters of a million dollars in cash, he had a Land Rover, a Camaro, motorcycles, a variety of restored cars at a nice residence in the Barnwell community. He had multiple firearms at his residence when he was arrested after the search warrant. He had an assault rifle, he had a pistol, he had pistol grip shotgun hidden throughout the house.

In his attempt to cooperate, as your Honor has already found, he was unable to be truthful, rendering what information he provided virtually useless to the government because of his inability to tell the truth.

Your Honor, he's continued throughout the process to refuse to accept full responsibility for what he's done. Your Honor saw it at the first objection with respect to 200 kilos, in an instance where Mr. Wiggins has dealt far more than that. He won't even accept responsibility even now to the quantity and the scale of narcotics trafficking that he was involved in.

Mr. Wiggins begins at an offense level 46. I've never actually seen a 46 in my experience. I think that's an extremely high offense level that reflects the extremely serious nature of the crimes he committed. I think particularly when your Honor combines that with him being a category five criminal history this is not an appropriate instance to vary.

Mr. Wiggins asked the court to impose a 300 month

sentence, is the request he's making. And in essence that would be a 12 level downward departure from the 46 down to what in essence would be a level 34 in a category five. We think that's not justified here under the circumstances and we would ask you to impose the guideline sentence.

THE COURT: Anything else?

MR. GIPSON: Nothing, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Richardson, has any of the cooperation that Mr. Wiggins provided useful to government?

MR. RICHARDSON: It has not been, your Honor, because we cannot make use of it. The difficulty is when someone is untruthful in one part, the other part of what they say is rendered virtually unusable. And this is an instance where he provided some information, and your Honor heard about some of that information. We provided testimony about it after he breached his proffer agreement. And you heard testimony from Special Agent McElwain about it. But the information that he's provided because he cannot be used as a credible source we can't then make use of it. We can't use it to do search warrants, we can't use it for indicting someone because he's not a usable witness.

I'd also add even to the extent it was theoretically credible he refuses to cooperate. He's refused to do anything since prior -- since well before the trial. So to the extent that he provided information it's simply not useful and cannot

be useful to government.

I mean, I will add, your Honor, as I added before in a variety of cases to you, and I add it here as I always do, if Mr. Wiggins wanted to come in and provide fully truthful testimony, fully truthful debriefing about everything that he's done and we're able to confirm the accuracy of what he's saying and he continues — doesn't continue lying to us, if we're able to arrange a time to do that, the agents I'm sure would be willing to do it for him to provide that information. And if we were able to use it then obviously we would give him credit for it. But as it currently stands, he refuses to cooperate, we cannot use the information.

THE COURT: There is a possibility then that if he cooperates and you are able to polygraph him and confirm the information there would be a possibility for a Rule 35?

MR. RICHARDSON: I think there is a possibility, your Honor. I'll contrast it with a case you are also familiar with, Earl Daniels who appeared before your Honor, part of the same case. In fact, he testified at Mr. Wiggins' case. And we appeared before you in that instance and I told you that I thought if he would come in and cooperate, because Mr. Daniels did not lie to law enforcement, he chose to go to trial, he was convicted, and then at that point came in, provided truthful information, he testified during this trial and he's currently serving a life sentence. I anticipate that as soon

as this sentencing is completed that you would see a Rule 35 request on that individual. Because he didn't lie, he was in a situation where he provided information that was useful to the government.

That is a possibility for Mr. Wiggins, but it's a much more remote possibility because he has lied. And the difficulty, as your Honor is well aware, is that once someone begins down that road of lying it is very difficult for us to rely on that information. Obviously possible. You have heard testimony from individuals who have failed polygraphs. I believe in the Sigmund James trial an individual testified, who's name is escaping me, but he testified even though he had previously failed a polygraph and had been untruthful.

The government was able to confirm information he was providing and he came clean and provided a full account of what he had done. So it's certainly possible, I'm aware of an instance where it occurred before, your Honor, but I wouldn't say it is a likely possibility, but it is a possibility.

THE COURT: Thank you. Anything else, Mr. Gipson?

MR. GIPSON: The only brief part that I would add,

your Honor, back in June of last year he did attempt to make

three controlled calls with the government. At that point in

time, your Honor, there was an attempt made at that point in

time, your Honor, to actively do some things for the

government, your Honor.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. RICHARDSON: The one thing I would add, your Honor, we do believe he has information on individuals who would be targets, were we able to use his information. The difficulty is we cannot use the information, so --THE COURT: Under what circumstances would you be able to use that information if he were to provide it? MR. RICHARDSON: If he was fully truthful. And that would obviously require some polygraph, some ways of the government trying to figure out how to verify it. Just like we have done in other instances where someone is untruthful for some particular reason and fails a polygraph, or is just untruthful, and we're able to determine that, those individuals can be rehabilitated. It is a much harder process than someone who is writing on a clean slate. But, your Honor, these people all the time who during the course of their cooperation may not have been fully truthful. However, right now Mr. Wiggins is not cooperating, he has refused to do so. And so I think we're quite a few steps away from figuring out how to corroborate and confirm whatever information he would provide. THE COURT: All right. I'm going to take a brief recess and I'll be right back. MR. RICHARDSON: Thank you, your Honor. MR. GIPSON: Thank you, your Honor.

(A recess transpired)

THE COURT: You may stand for sentencing. All right. Mr. Terrance Lamar Wiggins is before the court for the purpose of sentencing, having been found guilty by jury verdict of conspiracy to possess with intent to distribute and to distribute five kilograms or more of cocaine, possession of a firearm in furtherance of a drug trafficking crime, and felon in possession of firearms and ammunition.

The subject investigation in this case revealed that Mr. Wiggins was involved in a conspiracy to distribute kilogram quantities of cocaine in Barnwell County and surrounding areas of South Carolina from approximately 2005 through 2012. It's significant in this case that in 2005 when the investigation began there were several cooperating witnesses who detailed their drug activities with Mr. Wiggins. Several witnesses described their multi-kilogram quantity cocaine dealings with Mr. Wiggins.

There was a search warrant at Mr. Wiggins' house and during the search the investigators located quantities of marijuana, cocaine, six firearms, numerous rounds of ammunition, \$400,000 in U.S. currency, scales and other paraphernalia often used in the distribution of kilogram quantities of cocaine. Mr. Wiggins' mother's residence was also located across the street where they located more than \$180,000 in U.S. currency throughout the house. Mr. Wiggins has a history of abusing marijuana and cocaine, and he also

has a history of abuse of alcohol.

The court, having taken all of this into consideration, and having calculated and considered the advisory sentencing guidelines, and having also considered the relevant statutory sentencing factors that are contained in Title 18 United States Cod section 3553(a), has come to the judgment that the defendant, Terrance Lamar Wiggins, is hereby committed to the custody of the Bureau of Prisons to be imprison for a term of life.

(Disturbance in the audience)

(There was a pause in the proceedings)

THE COURT: This term consists of life as to counts one and 120 months as to count four, said terms to run concurrently, and 60 months as to count three, said term to run consecutively to the terms previously imposed on counts one and four.

According to the Fourth Circuit's decision in U.S. versus Kratsas the court finds that when a defendant is facing a sentence of life the court must apply the three part test articulated by the Supreme Court in Solem, advising that an extensive proportionality analysis is required in those cases involving a life sentence. Applying Solem's first prong, the defendant's offense was extremely grave because drug use is a pervasive, destructive force in American society. The defendant was not merely a user or even a single distributor

of drugs but was involved in obtaining and distributing multi-ounce quantities of crack cocaine and cocaine over a period of multiple years from various sources in the state of South Carolina. And the defendant distributed at least 200 kilograms of cocaine during the course of his involvement in the offense of conviction.

Applying Solem's second prong, the court finds that a life sentence for a major drug violation is not disproportionate in comparison with other sentences under the guidelines. Applying Solem's third prong, the court finds a review of the state statutes within this circuit disclose the existence of similarly severe sentences for narcotics violations of the magnitude involved here.

It does not appear that the defendant has the ability to pay a fine, therefore the fine is waived. The defendant shall pay the mandatory \$300 special assessment fee, which consists of \$100 on each of his three counts of conviction. The defendant shall forfeit his interest in property as directed in the preliminary order of forfeiture filed April 19 of 2013, and the said order is incorporated herein as part of this judgment.

Should the defendant be released from imprisonment he will be placed on supervised release for a term of ten years, consisting of ten years as to count one and three years as to counts three and four, said terms to run concurrently.

Within 72 hours of release from custody of the Bureau of Prisons the defendant shall report in person to the probation office in the district to which he is released.

While he's on supervised release he shall comply with the mandatory and standard conditions of supervision that are outlined in Title 18 United States Code Section 3583(d), and he shall also comply with the following special conditions:

He shall participate in a substance abuse treatment program, to include drug testing, as approved by the United States

Probation Officer. Unless he's able to secure stable and verifiable employment he shall participate in a vocational training or work force development program as approved by the United States Probation Office.

The findings of fact of the presentence report are adopted as the reasons for the sentence and are incorporated by reference.

I'm also making a recommendation to the Bureau of Prisons that he be considered for the intensive drug treatment program at the Bureau of Prisons.

Mr. Wiggins, you are advised that a criminal defendant has the right to appeal a sentence in certain circumstances and you should discuss with your lawyer as to whether or not you are entitled to an appeal in this case.

With few exceptions any notice of appeal must be file within 14 days after judgment in your case is entered. Do you

45 understand? 1 2 DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am. I'm also going to advise you, Mr. 3 THE COURT: Wiggins, that you take into account the information that was 4 5 provided at this hearing by the government and there is an 6 opportunity for your sentence to be reduced if you provide 7 truthful information to the government that can be relied on. In that situation, if the government finds that information to 8 9 be reliable and truthful, they can, if they so find, file a 10 Rule 35 motion in your behalf and ask your sentence be 11 reduced. Do you understand? 12 DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am. 13 THE COURT: As a result, the motion for variance in 14 this case has been denied. Is there anything else? MR. RICHARDSON: Nothing from the government your 15 16 Honor. MR. GIPSON: Nothing from the defendant, your Honor. 17 18 (Recess, 5:42 p.m.) 19 20 I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter. 21 22 Date: 9-4-13 Daniel E. Mayo 23 24 25